associated with his donations. So little did he look for eleemosynary immortality, indeed, that he took steps to ensure that his benefactions should be expended within a comparatively short period of years. The spirit of his charities was thus even more important than their extent. It was a contribution not to one cause or another, but to the common store of humanity.

The Rothschild family is to-day taken as the out-standing example of the Jew in high finance. It is less generally realised how unselfishly they have made use of the riches which they amassed: for, if any family has regarded its accumulated wealth as a public trust/ it is this one. For a period of several generations, the name is repeated with impressive regularity in every beneficent enterprise and endeavour over half of Europe; and, up to the war of 1914-18, their firm figured at the head of the subscription list of almost every charitable fund raised in the City of London. To recount their benefactions in detail would be a wearisome task; but it is impossible to touch upon this subject without making specific mention of their liberality in some directions.

It is perhaps legitimate to say that they were among the foremost to recognise that housing conditions are the key to many other social problems, and that they led in the attempt to cope with the abuse. Betty de Roth-schild, of Paris (widow of Baron James de Rothschild, founder of the French house), shewed her interest in the timid spirit of unscientific benefaction when, on her death in 1886, she left 600,000 francs to the

public charities, to assist poor labourers in paying their rents. Her three sons, advancing beyond this elementary conception, subscribed 10,000,000 francs in 1904, to be employed in the erection of inexpensive dwelling-houses, and for the general furtherance of plans for ameliorating the condition